8. (Amended) A satellite system as recited in claim [1] 7 wherein said at least one of said plurality of beam **segment** portions being independently adjustable in response to a condition.

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action mailed October 3, 2000, claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Claims 11-30, however, have been withdrawn in view of the restriction requirement made on September 20, 2000. Applicant has added no new matter to the application by these amendments.

Applicant confirms the election of group 1 corresponding to claims 1-10.

The present invention solves problems not identified or solved in the prior art by providing a satellite system that has at least a first satellite and a second satellite wherein the first satellite and the second satellite generate a respective first set of spot beams that partially covers a land mass and a second set of spot beams that together with the first set of spot beams provides ubiquitous coverage over the land mass. A variation of the ubiquitous coverage theme is presented in claims 7 and 8 which are directed to a system in which the first plurality of spot beams have beam segment portions that correspond to areas or portions of the beam which are shown in Figure 13. The beam segment portions may be individually controlled so that based upon a predetermined condition these beam portions may be individually adjustable. As is known in the art, spot beams typically are controlled as one continuous beam and therefore portions of the beam corresponding to an area upon the earth are not individually adjustable.

Claims 1 and 5-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Rouffett* et al. (*Rouffett*). Applicant respectively traverses.

For a proper anticipation rejection, each and every element of the claims must be present in a single reference. The Examiner has pointed to *Rouffett* for these teachings. Admittedly, *Rouffett* teaches two satellites, however, that is where the similarities differ. *Rouffett* teaches a satellite system that is used for direct television broadcasting. The *Rouffett* reference specifically teaches a system that directs a first beam for primary coverage and has a second beam that provides redundant coverage for a separate area that is covered by the primary beam of another satellite. This system, however, fails specifically to teach a first plurality of spot beams providing partial coverage over a land mass and a second plurality of spot beams that together

provide ubiquitous coverage over the land mass as recited in claim 1. Because of the purpose of the *Rouffett* reference, it is not surprising that such a system is not disclosed. In many satellite systems, a single satellite is attempting to try and provide coverage for the land mass. Typically, because of limitations of the satellites, ubiquitous coverage of a land mass cannot be provided. Applicant has recognized this and provided a second satellite with a plurality of second spot beams which in combination with the first spot beams provides ubiquitous coverage over the land mass. Therefore, because each and every element of claim 1 is not taught in the *Rouffett* reference, Applicant respectively requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection relative to claim 1. With respect to claims 5-7, these claims are dependent upon their independent claims and therefore are also believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Applicant respectively submits however that *Rouffett* also does not illustrate beam segment portions as set forth in claim 7. As recited in claims 8-10, and more specifically in claim 8, the *Rouffett* reference also does not illustrate that the beam segment portions are independently adjustable in response to a condition. The beam segment portions as mentioned above and as illustrated in Figure 13, has beam segment portions that correspond to a land area smaller than that of a beam. No such teaching is provided in the *Rouffett* reference. For these reasons and in addition to the reasons set forth above, claims 7-10 are also believed to be patentable.

Claims 2-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being patentable over *Rouffett* et al in view of *Lynch*. More specifically, the *Rouffett* reference does not provide specific teaching of all of the types of satellites such as MEO, GEO, or IGSO satellites or teachings that the spot beams are V-band or K-band. The Examiner has cited the *Lynch* reference to provide the shortcomings in the *Rouffett* reference. However, the *Lynch* reference does not provide the missing elements of claim 1. Namely, the *Lynch* reference does not provide a first plurality of spot beams and a second plurality of spot beams that in combination provides substantially ubiquitous coverage over the land mass. Therefore, even if the *Lynch* reference is combined with the *Rouffett* reference, the present invention cannot be formed. Such a combination therefore is not taught or suggested by either reference. Therefore, Applicant respectively requests reconsideration of this rejection as well.

Applicant, therefore, submits that the instant application is now in the proper form for immediate allowance. If it would facilitate review of this case, please feel free to contact the undersigned representative of applicant at (310) 662-9916.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael W. Sales
Registration No. 30,213

Date: December 20, 2000

Hughes Electronics Corp.
Building 001 M/S A109
200 N. Sepulveda Blvd.
P. O. Box 956
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956
(310) 662-9916
(310) 322-0856 (Fax)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D. C. 20231, on Dec 20, 2000
(Date of Deposit)

Name of applicant, assignee, or Registered Representative

Signature

Dec 20 2000
Date of Signature